



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Classical Philology

VOLUME XVII

October 1922

NUMBER 4

THE TEXT TRADITION OF DONATUS' *COMMENTARY* ON *TERENCE*

BY CHARLES H. BEESON

The *Donatus Commentary on Terence* has been subject to many vicissitudes both in its manuscript and its printed form. The early editions were unsatisfactory because, with one or two exceptions, the editors used only inferior MSS; the last of these old editions—there were about fifty in all—was published by Klotz in 1838–40 and was based entirely on earlier editions.

The first attempt at a critical edition was made by Schopen, whose dissertation on Donatus (1821) was followed in 1826 by a *Specimen emendationis* of a small part of the text. Schopen realized that his manuscript foundation was insufficient and in 1851 he began a search for new material and enlisted the services of Vahlen for this work. Upon his death in 1867 the material he had collected was given to Reifferscheid, who used it in publishing parts of the text of Donatus and Evanthius (1868, 1874, 1875). The necessity of further study of the MSS became evident and Wissowa undertook to examine the Italian MSS; the death of Reifferscheid in 1887 put an end to the projected edition. Before this Ritschl had discussed the MSS and early editions of Donatus in connection with his edition of the *Vita* of Terence by Suetonius, prefixed to Reifferscheid's edition of Suetonius. The next important contributions were made by Dziatzko in *Rheinisches Museum* (1874, 1879). The greatest

advance was made by Sabbadini, whose researches in the Italian libraries made it possible for the first time to form a fairly accurate picture of the text tradition of Donatus, the value of the MSS, and their interrelationships.¹ By way of illustration he published portions of the *Commentary* represented by various groups of MSS—several of the important MSS are incomplete. The ground had therefore been pretty well cleared when Wessner undertook the difficult task of preparing a critical edition. On the basis of collations made by himself, Wissowa and others, with the help of Sabbadini's contributions, he published an admirable preliminary report in *Rheinisches Museum*,² but it was not until 1902 and 1905 that the edition appeared. The result justified the long delay; we now have a trustworthy text (it deserves to be called an *editio princeps*) with a critical apparatus that satisfies the demands even of the paleographer—something that cannot be said of most of our recent editions of Latin texts.

The earliest mention of the *Commentary* in the Middle Ages is found in a letter of Lupus of Ferrières (*Ep.* 103) to Pope Benedict (855–58). In this letter Lupus asks for a MS of Jerome's commentary on Jeremiah "post sextum librum," a work which, left unfinished by Jerome, comprised only six books; but Lupus evidently thought his own MS was defective. Lupus asks further for MSS of Cicero's *De oratore* and the twelve books of Quintilian; of these authors he has only parts and he desires complete texts. His final request is for a MS of Donatus: "pari intentione Donati commentum in Terentio flagitamus." The reason why Lupus is asking for a MS of Donatus is probably the same as in the other cases—the copy that he has is defective and he wants a complete one. Lupus' MS probably came from Fleury, the famous Benedictine monastery situated only a short distance from Ferrières, with whose treasures he was undoubtedly well acquainted. Our oldest MS of the *Commentary* (Paris 7920, eleventh century) came from Fleury and there is no reason to doubt that it is a copy of an older Fleury MS. It is possible that Lupus' acquaintance with Donatus dates back to his

¹ *Museo italiano di antichità classica*, III (1890), 319 ff. and 381 ff.; *Studi italiani di filologia classica*, II (1894), 1 ff., and III (1895), 249 ff.

² LII (1897), 69 ff.

stay in Fulda, where he was a student under Rhabanus Maurus for a number of years; Mayence, the home of one of our lost MSS, was within the sphere of influence of Fulda and used the same script, the Insular.

Our two oldest MSS attest an interest in the *Commentary* in the eleventh and thirteenth centuries in France, and here too toward the end of the fourteenth century Nicolai de Clemangiis cites Donatus.¹ The *Commentary*, however, did not become widely known until the following century. The Council of Bâle (1431-49), like the Council of Constance before it, gave a great impulse to the study of classical authors and the search for their MSS; among the MSS discovered at this time was a codex of Donatus. In 1433 Aurispa writes from Bâle to Tebalducci at Florence that he has discovered a MS of Donatus at Mayence. About two years later Pier Candido writes from Florence to Pizzolpasso, archbishop of Milan, who was in attendance at the council between the years 1432 and 1439, that he is sending him the text of the *Phormio*, which he has excerpted from his (i.e. Pizzolpasso's) MS, at the same time complaining of the difficulty of his task.² Pizzolpasso replies that he is making him a present of a copy of the *Phormio* which his secretary has made (from Candido's copy). The situation is made clear by two letters of Pizzolpasso to Candido written in 1437.³ Nicholas of Cues, it appears, had gained possession of the Mayence codex and had given it to Pizzolpasso; the latter had brought it, or sent it, to Milan and commissioned Candido to make a copy of it. Candido copied the *Phormio* and sent it to Pizzolpasso but it is not clear whether he continued his work, though he probably did. Complete copies of this codex were made later in Italy as will appear below. In addition to these MSS we must assume that there was in existence another copy of the Mayence codex, made by Aurispa, or for him, probably immediately after its discovery. Aurispa returned to Florence at the end of 1434; he followed the papal court on its travels to Bologna and Ferrara and on its return to Florence and probably carried his

¹ Sabbadini, *Storia e Critica di Testi Latini*, p. 206.

² A copy of this letter is prefixed to the text of Donatus in the Oxford codex (C); it was published by Dziatzko, *Jahrb. f. class. Philol. Suppl.*, X, 692, and Sabbadini, *Mus. ital.*, III, 407.

³ Sabbadini, *Mus. ital.*, III, 411 and 415.

Donatus with him; Sabbadini assumes that this was the beginning of the diffusion of Donatus MSS in Italy.¹ Aurispa's correspondence² reveals the characteristic activity of the Humanists in seeking new MSS, copying and correcting them—and often failing to return them to their owners; in this activity Donatus plays an important rôle.

In the year 1451 we find another important MS of the *Commentary* in Italy, again in the hands of Aurispa. As early as 1447 Laurentius Valla had written³ from Naples to Giovanni Tortelli requesting him to ask the Cardinal Prospero Colonna, or anyone else that had a copy of Donatus, whether there was a complete copy of the *Commentum* and whether Donatus wrote a commentary on all the plays of Terence (none of our MSS has a commentary on the *Heautontimoroumenos*). A friend of his, he added, saw a Donatus “apud Carnotum sine tertia comoedia *Ἐαυτοντιμορουμένω* et non integra quinta *Ἐκυρᾷ* itemque cum defectu in sexta, quae dicitur *Φορμίων*. Aurispa writes from Rome in January, 1451, that he has known for a long time that there is a Donatus “Carnuti in Gallia, in bibliotheca ecclesiae maioris.” He has had it copied and has received the copy; he is now having it transcribed, and when the work is finished he will send the original to Panhormita, not as a gift but that others too may make use of it. Three weeks later he writes again, repeating the statement that he is having the MS transcribed “ut ipsius copiam amicis facere possim ne forte mihi eveniret quod Guarinus, Karolus et tu mihi fecistis” (Aurispa refers to the difficulty he had had in recovering MSS he had lent to these friends).

We have therefore information about three MSS of Donatus brought to Italy: Aurispa's copy of the Mayence codex (probably to Florence in 1434), the Mayence codex itself (to Milan in 1436) and Aurispa's copy of the Chartres MS (to Rome in 1450). We find a reference to one other Donatus MS in Aurispa's correspondence. He writes to Panhormita,⁴ probably in 1446, that the monk who brought Donatus' *Commentary on Virgil* to Italy has found a commentary of Donatus on three plays of Plautus and at his request has written to France for it. But in spite of Aurispa's assurance that the

¹ Sabbadini, *Studi ital.*, II, 17.

² Sabbadini, *Biografia documentata di Giovanni Aurispa*, Noto, 1891.

³ Sabbadini, *Mus. ital.*, III, 387.

⁴ Sabbadini, *Aurispa*, p. 107.

monk is "doctus et solers antiquitatis indagator, quamvis Gallus," he has probably mistaken, as Sabbadini suggests, Terence for Plautus. A Paris codex (7921, *saec.* xv) contains a commentary on three plays of Terence and this MS, or a similar one, may be what he had in mind. There is no evidence that Aurispa ever received the MS.

The purpose of this article is to determine the character of the various lost archetypes through which the MSS have come down to us and to point out the disastrous effects of their script on the text. The outline given above, based largely on Sabbadini's articles, furnishes the necessary background for discussing the relationship of the MSS of the Italian group.

No other profane Latin text offers such abundant and convincing evidence of the stages through which it has come down to us. This is all the more surprising because most of the evidence is derived from MSS of the fifteenth century, MSS in which we expect to find the traces of their descent obliterated or confused through the activity of the Humanists. No other text exhibits such bewildering paleographical confusion or betrays such helplessness on the part of the scribes in dealing with a puzzling script and still more puzzling abbreviations.

In discussing the various stages of transmission I shall follow Wessner's stemma,¹ though I believe it to be incorrect in important particulars. The evidence given can be easily applied to the rearrangement I shall suggest at the close of this article.

The text of the *Commentum* in its present form goes back to the sixth and seventh centuries. In regard to the script of the original MS Wessner² contents himself with calling it majuscule; he points out that in several places in our oldest MS Latin words or letters adjacent to Greek words are written in majuscule, i.e. the scribe who copied the majuscule archetype in a minuscule script failed to distinguish between the Greek and Latin text and transcribed some of the Latin text as well as the Greek words in majuscule (Greek minuscule did not make its appearance in Latin MSS until the ninth century).

¹ Sabbadini's classification is as follows: Class I is composed of ACRTVB; II, aO; III, b = *ed. pr.*; IV, PcdLMNrstxz. Especial precaution is necessary in regard to the signatures of the MSS; Dziatzko's P = Wessner's A; Sabbadini's P = Wessner's F; Wessner's P = Paris 7921.

² Praef. p. viii.

this case, however, I am inclined to believe that we have an instance of metathesis, like *recte* for *certe* (90. 6).¹ An uncial codex of forty lines to the page would certainly be unusual; Sabbadini's calculations would apply equally well to a minuscule MS and the lacunae may not have been in the uncial codex at all. The original MS was undoubtedly uncial, probably with a mixture of half-uncial letters. This is the script one would expect to be used in the sixth and seventh centuries and the use of uncial for technical works is especially common; over forty of the four hundred uncial MSS that have survived belong in this category. The confusion of *i* and *t*, of which there are several examples, may be due to this script.

The lemmata were written in rustic capitals to distinguish them from the commentary, as the following errors prove: 88. 20 *MEUM*] *at eū* A; 148. 5 *MORA*] *moni* A; 168. 14 *ACCURATE*] *accū te* A; 82. 16 *meo* (incorrectly included in the lemma) *AAeo* A, *adeo* TCV.

That the MSS go back to a minuscule archetype was recognized by Sabbadini and Wessner, but they did not attempt to determine its character. Lejay in his review of Wessner's edition² makes a cautious suggestion that the archetype was perhaps in the Insular script but the two examples he cites as evidence are not to the point.³

The confusion of letters (*u* and *a*, *u* and *n*, *t* and *c*, *ni* and *iu*, and especially *r* and *t*) point to a MS in Caroline minuscule intervening between the uncial archetype and the immediate archetype (which I shall call X) of α and β . Other errors make it clear that X is descended, directly or indirectly, from a MS written in the Insular script (which I shall call Y).

The most striking proof that Y was an Insular MS is furnished by the confusion of the words *post* and *propter* in X. There are several forms of abbreviating these words in the Irish and the Anglo-

¹ A parallel case occurs in ii. 249. 13; here the codex Cuiacianus, which belongs to the β family, has *partum*, the right reading, while the other MSS, all of the fifteenth century, have *raptum*. Since this error originated within the β family it could not have been caused by a confusion of uncial letters; it must be due to a confusion of Insular letters or to metathesis. The archetype of the β family was an Insular MS. The reverse process has taken place in ii. 337. 13; here *partum* is found in all the MSS for *raptum*. Other examples are: 388. 2 *mirari* for *rimari*; 402. 20 *nam sit* for *mansit*; ii. 45. 14 *captio* for *pactio*; ii. 81. 23 *sentiat* for *nesciat* (V).

² *Revue critique*, LVI (1903), 168-72.

³ "De singulaires lapsus [*ante pour enim*, 172. 18, *duo pour hic*, 136. 2] pourraient peut-être permettre de supposer une mauvaise lecture d'écriture insulaires."

Saxon scripts; Lindsay describes¹ the form $\bar{p}l$ as characteristically Anglo-Saxon for *post*; he also calls attention² to the use of the curious form $\bar{p}l^3$ for *propter* at Mayence, as evidenced by two Anglo-Saxon MSS originally from Mayence but now in the Vatican; he gives a third example from a Limoges MS. Now there are thirteen places where both families of our MSS have *post* while the sense requires *propter* and the only possible explanation is that this rare abbreviation for *propter* was found in Y and was misunderstood by the copyist of X, or some intervening MS. I count, of course, only the cases where both families are represented. For the greater part of the text we have only the testimony of the β family, which furnishes twenty-five additional examples. There is not much doubt, however, that most, if not all, of these errors were already in X. It is possible, therefore, that Y was written at Mayence and that France is not, as is generally assumed, the land that preserved Donatus for us.⁴

Further evidence that Y was written in the Insular script is found in the confusion of the letters *n*, *p*, and *r*. Only those errors are cited here which occur in all the MSS of both families and presumably therefore existed in X; it is extremely improbable that X had the right reading in all these cases and that the errors were made independently by the scribes of α and β : *n* for *p*: 318. 6 *voluptatem*] *voluntatem*; *p* for *n*: 82. 17 *voluntate*] *voluptate*; 87. 4 *voluntas*] *voluptas*; *p* for *r*: 110. 4 *incertarum*] *inceptarum*; 288. 10 *rarum*] *parum*; *r* for *p*: *disceptionem*] *dissertationem*.⁵

¹ *Notae Latinae*, p. 193.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 200.

³ This abbreviation regularly stands for *praeter* and was evidently so used in ii. 13. 18 where AV have incorrectly expanded it into *propter*.

⁴ Wessner makes the Moguntinus a copy of the Carnotensis while Manitius, *Geschichte der Lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters*, p. 486, n. 5, thinks that the Moguntinus is derived from the MS belonging to Lupus of Ferrières. Mayence was an important Anglo-Saxon center; however, the presence of an Insular MS, especially a commentary or grammar, in Fleury or Chartres need not cause surprise. The archetype of the Mayence Insular MS of the fourth decade of Livy apparently came from Chartres (Traube, *Palaeographische Forschungen*, IV, 26).

⁵ Of course the confusion of these letters can take place in other scripts; any letter can be mistaken for another no matter how unlike they may be; one word may be confused with another. The interchange of *voluptas* and *voluntas* is common, due to the confusion of the words, which were often associated; cf. the addition made in the insular MS Bâle F. iii. 15. a, f. 29^v at the end of *De proprietate sermonum*: "Inter voluntatem et volumtatem et volumptatem et voluptatem hoc interest quod voluntas

There is practically no evidence as to the character of the script of X. We cannot depend on abbreviations, because any Insular forms we assume for X may have been copied from Y. They show only that X or Y was Insular.

The MSS from which X descended contained a bewildering variety of abbreviations which caused great confusion throughout the entire tradition. Some of these were undoubtedly in the uncial archetype but most of them may be regarded as Insular in character, whether by adoption or invention. The Insular scribes tended to use many abbreviations, especially in grammatical texts, commentaries, etc. The early MSS of Donatus seem to have been written while the abbreviating systems were still in a state of flux. Thus *pt*, with one or two abbreviating strokes, meant not only *propter* and *post*, as stated above, but also *potest* and *praeter*—all Insular except the last, and that occurs in our MSS. This explains why we find *praeter* for *potest* (four times) and for *post* (three times). *Pro* for *post* (30. 18) may point to an abbreviation *p* with suprascript *o*, common in the Insular script; *postquam* for *proquam* (441. 2 V) may be due to the same abbreviation. We find the same uncertainty in regard to the abbreviation *s*· (or *s*,); it is found in Insular MSS for *sic*, *sed*, *secundum* and *scilicet* and is often mistaken for *si*, especially in the Insular script on account of the ligature (cf. 193. 15 where A has *offens*· for *offensi*). So we find in our MSS *si*=*sed*; *sic*=*si*, *sed*, *secundum*; *scilicet*=*si*, *sic*, *sed*; in all there are about thirty cases of this sort. Similarly *id̄* caused trouble. It is found for *idem* once or twice and for *id est* several times; in ii. 439. 3 RC have *idem*, O has *id est* and V has *vel* (i.e. *ut*; the loop of *d* was mistaken for the second stroke of *u*; ii. 270. 16 we find *id est* for *vel* in X; the confusion of these letters and of the *propter*-*post* abbreviations is responsible for the reading *postulare* for *propter id* 127. 17 (Y must have been written in a compact script). Wessner here reads *ideo*; it is possible that we have here *id̄*=*ideo*, of which Lindsay gives an example¹

dei est voluntas diabuli voluptas mali desiderii." In the same way the presence of Insular abbreviations does not necessarily mean that they were copied from an Insular MS. A continental scribe writing Caroline minuscule might use them occasionally. Later many of them passed into common use.

¹ *Notae Latinae*, p. 110.

from a Cologne MS (Irish scribe), but it may be that the usual abbreviation (*idō*) was misread.

Nam seems to have been abbreviated with the initial letter as well as *non*; there are about twenty cases where they are confused. The usual confusion between *ergo* and *igitur* occurs—there are about a dozen cases.

We find *dicit* abbreviated in several ways in our text: by suspension, *d*, or *ḏ*; the former caused such errors as *quid* or *quod* for *qui dicit* (358. 2) and the latter has been expanded into *de* nine times, seven times in the archetype of all the MSS; *ḏ*, or another suspension *diḥ*, which occurs a few times, is responsible for the reading *dum* (i.e. *dū*) which occurs eight times; *do* for *dicit*, which occurs twice, is a mistake for *de* or for *dē* (syllabic suspension); I have observed no case of *dl* for *dicit* but the many mistakes in writing *dicitur* (*dṛ*) for *dicit* point to such an abbreviation (contraction) unless we assume an abbreviation by suspension as the cause. There are also many cases of *dicitur* for *dixit*.

The Insular abbreviations that perhaps caused the most trouble in our text are the *quam*, *quia*, *quod* series; the abbreviations for these words consist of *q* with the tail bisected by strokes that often differ very little from one another, especially when carelessly made; they were frequently mistaken by the Insular scribes themselves and still more frequently by scribes not familiar with that script. They were also confused with the continental abbreviation for *qui* (*q*) and apparently with a rare Insular abbreviation for *que*, which also involved *quae* in the confusion. In all there are about a hundred passages where one of the series *quam*, *quia*, *quod*, *qui*, *que* (*quae*) has been mistaken for another and in many of these passages the scribes have expanded the abbreviation in three different ways. A few errors already existed in X, e.g. 19. 19 *quod*] *quam* A *quia* TFCV; 302. 19 *quam*] *quam quod* BTCV (an interlinear correction was copied in the text along with the original error); errors in all the MSS in that part of the text represented only by the β family may have originated in β or in X, e.g. 475. 14 *quam*] *quia* β ; ii. 205. 10 *quod*] *quam* CV; ii. 390. 17 *quia*] *qui* V *quam* RCO. The confusion of *quando* for *quomodo* in X (290. 1) was probably due to an Insular abbreviation; *quando* was not ordinarily abbreviated except in Insular.

To prove that X was an Insular MS we must depend on the confusion of *n, p, r* in AB as against the MSS of the β family or vice versa; we are thus limited to that part of the text represented by both A and B (about a seventh part of the whole). Errors in A alone or in B alone do not count since their archetype (*a*), as will be shown presently, was an Insular MS and the error could have been made by the scribe of A or B as well as by the scribe of *a*. Now there are no cases of this sort in AB and only two in β ; 122. 3 *voluntatem*] A, *voluptatem* TCV; 8. 5 *sarcinarum*] A, *sati* (*y* FV) *rarum* TFV. The evidence therefore is quite insufficient to warrant any conclusion. The β family furnishes a number of examples from that part of the text not contained in A or B but we cannot tell whether the mistakes were made by the scribe of X or of β ; e.g. ii. 33. 13 *aptius*] *artius* V *arctius* C; ii. 64. 11 *quae sit ars*] *quesit as* C, *queritans* V; there are a half-dozen cases where *voluptas* and *voluntas* are confused.

Wessner has shown that A and B are not independent copies of X but are derived from a copy (*a*) of that MS. There can be no doubt that this copy was written in the Insular script. I shall first give the evidence furnished by that part of the text contained in A and B. Here again abbreviations are of no value but if we find A or B repeatedly confusing *n, p*, and *r* the only explanation is that in the archetype these letters were written in a script that made these confusions possible, and that script must be the Insular. We may have a confusion of *n* for *p* in 197. 5 *supra*] *sim'* A; the Insular abbreviation for *supra* is *sup̄*, which was corrupted to the meaningless *sun̄*; this in turn was corrected, consciously or unconsciously, to *sim'*; *n* for *r*: 128. 2 *efficaciorem*] *efficationem* A, corrected by A², to *efficaciorem*; 134. 10 *recte*] *nocte* A; 150. 17 *gratia*] *ḡna* A (*gratia* is commonly abbreviated *ḡra*); 176. 18 *adierunt*] *adie non* A (the verb was written *adier̄*—*r̄* is regular for *-runt*—*r̄* was mistaken for *n̄* and *n̄* was expanded into *non*; the words were evidently not separated in the archetype); a probable case is 174. 9 *expetit oratorie*] *expenatorie* A (the lemma was abbreviated, as often, to *exp̄* and *o* was mistaken for *e*—a common error); possibly also 28. 21 *ara*] *ami* A; *r* for *n*: 134. 6 *genere*] *ḡr* A (evidently an arbitrary abbreviation stood in the archetype, *ḡn̄*); 199. 13 *anacoluthon*] *anacoluthor* A; 215. 3 *inm.*] in B,

ira A (a probably read *in*, A mistook *r* for *n* and added *a* to make a Latin word). The confusion of *l* and *b* occurs with especial frequency in Insular MSS owing to the peculiar curve to the left at the bottom of the shaft in both letters; there is one example in A 240. 10 *celerem*] *ceberem*.

The evidence from B that *a* was Insular is meager. We find *r* mistaken for *n* 139. 12 *miratur*] *minatur* B; *r* was apparently mistaken for *p* 135. 17 *convenire*] *conve·nup·* B.

The following errors are found in A where B is lacking; here we cannot be sure that they were not already in *a*; *n* for *r*: 35. 3 *Terentio*] *tenent·*; 60. 4 *rationem*] *natū*; 100. 1 *res*] *ines*; 112. 7 *ingratum*] *ingnatum*; ii. 19. 18 *ratione*] *natione*; *r* for *n*: 25. 21 *Rinthonica*] *rinthorica*; 31. 7 *Serranae*] *serrare*; 36. 10 *minoris*] *miroris*, with *minoris* above the line; 93. 14 *consentivam*] *consercinam*; 256. 8 *acceptione*] *accepto rone* (probably written in the archetype *acceptione*, with *on* above *or*); A has confused *r* and *y* twice; 9. 13 *maceror*] *macero*y and 253. 17 *asyndetos*] *asrndetos*; this confusion is not uncommon in Insular MSS, but it also occurs in ordinary minuscule of a pronounced cursive character.

Examples of the confusion of the abbreviations for *quam*, *quia* and *quod* are numerous; e.g. *quam* for *quod* 89. 21 (A); *quod* for *quam* 124. 9 (A, *quam* A²); 127. 3 (B); 172. 2 (B); 255. 13, twice, (B); ii. 285. 3 (B); ii. 298. 4 (B); ii. 308. 19 (B); *quod* for *quia* ii. 270. 3 (B); ii. 294. 23 (B); ii. 301. 20 (B); ii. 308. 18 (B); *quam* for *quia* 231. 16 (A). There are a number of cases where *que* is confused with *quam*, *quia* or *quod*: 25. 8 *que*] *q*; *quia* A (evidently *quia* was written originally, *q*; was written above as a correction, and later copied into the text); 94. 19 and 95. 1 where A has the Insular abbreviation for *quod*; 155. 10 *quoque*] *q q* A; 134. 9 *nusquam*] *nusq*; A; 240. 17 *quicquam*] *quoquam* A C², *quoque* BTC; ii. 307. 11 *quod*] *quia* C, *que* B; ii. 310. 4 *quod*] *que* BC. It is possible that the non-Insular abbreviation for *qui* (*q*) is responsible for the following errors: *qui* for *quia*¹ 23. 8 (A); 53. 15 (AV); 189. 3 (A, *quod* T); 202. 6 (A, *quid* T, *quod* C); 239. 17 (BCV); ii. 311. 16 (Bβ); *qui* for *quod* 104. 23 (A, *p* TC); 147. 5 (A); ii. 309. 14 (B); *quod* for *qui* 99. 8 (A); 243. 22 (B); 252. 8 (A); 333. 14 (B, *p* TC); *p* and *q* are confused several

¹ The cases where *quia* is followed by *a* are not included.

times in our MSS); *que* for *qui* 170. 4 (A); 172. 17 (A); ii. 317. 14 (B β). Of course it is not necessary to assume that all these errors are due to abbreviations; the carelessness of the scribe is without doubt often responsible and the text of a commentary (like that of a grammar) is especially liable to change. On the other hand, this multiplicity of abbreviations does not appear impossible if we bear in mind that several generations of MSS are involved, that more than one scribe was probably active on each one of them and that some, at least, of the MSS were carelessly and hastily written.

The number of cases where the Insular abbreviations for *haec* and *hoc* were confused is surprisingly small—less than a half-dozen. The mistake of *homo* for *hoc* may be due to the fact that Insular scribes often abbreviated *homo* (*hō*). The lemma *hem* is transcribed several times as *hoc est* or *haec est* (i.e. *hē*, with the *m*-stroke over *e* mistaken as two abbreviating strokes), e.g. 184. 19 (AV); 192. 14 (A); 204. 15 (A, twice); 229. 9 (A, *hic* TC). The Insular abbreviation for *huius* (*h̄s*) is responsible for a number of errors. It was probably in X and passed into α and β ; in 95. 20 A expanded it into *haec sunt* (\bar{s} is the regular abbreviation for *sunt* in A), V expanded it correctly, but TC have *has*; 102. 16 A repeated his mistake, V misunderstood the abbreviation but V² corrected it, while TC have *hēs*; 108. 22 C has *hēs*; 115. 16 T has *hec*; 115. 1 A has *haec sunt*, V² again corrected the error of V, TC have *huius*. The error in A 192. 15 *ante] ea n̄* is due to the Insular abbreviation for *ante* (*añ*). This abbreviation may account for the reading of V 174. 14 *apud* (expunged) *ante* for *ante* (*aṗ* is the Insular abbreviation for *apud*; \bar{n} was mistaken for \bar{p} ; the correction was written above the line and later copied in the line along with the error); C has *tn*. Another Insular compendium (\bar{a} =*aut*) caused the error *aut* for *an* (*a* with an *n*-stroke above it) in 206. 10 (BTC) and 289. 6 (B). These words are confused eight times in our MSS. The words *tamen* and *tantum* were originally abbreviated only in the Insular script; the compendium *t̄m* was used for both and this naturally caused confusion; 174. 4 B has *t̄m* for *tamen* but in 245. 9 he writes *tantum* for *tamen*. The (late) Insular abbreviation for *usque* (*uṣ*) occurs once in B (240. 17) and the Insular abbreviation for *ut* (*ū*) once (223. 3).

The practice of Insular scribes of putting an apex over certain monosyllabic words sometimes caused confusion, as the apex was often undistinguishable from an abbreviating stroke or an *m*- (or *n*-) stroke; e.g. we find *siē* for *sic* in A (73. 3), in T (240. 11) and C (203. 9) but *siē* is also the common abbreviation for *sicut*; this explains why in 163. 13 B has *sic*, the correct reading, while ATCV have *sicut*; X and *a* probably had *sic* with an apex, which A and *β* mistook for an abbreviating stroke; 171. 2 V wrote *sicut* for *sic* which V² corrected; the reverse process took place in 60. 10 where *sic ut* is right; A has *siē* and TC have *sic*. The error in 59. 8 where A has *nē* (= *nunc*) for *sic* is probably to be explained in the same way; the ligature *si*, which is peculiar to the Insular script, often resembles a high-backed, round-shouldered *n*, the apex was again mistaken for an abbreviating stroke; the same error occurs in ii. 276. 1 in B. The confusion of letters is reversed in 225. 18 where C has *esiphasis* for *enphasis* (*exifasis* T) and in 233. 13 where A has *occulta sis* for *occultans*, and probably in 173. 9 where A has *necafis* for *notans*; *n* looked like the *si*-ligature but the eleventh-century scribe was familiar only with the *fi*-ligature which is often hard to distinguish from the Insular form and so copied *fi*; the confusion of *o* and *t* for *e* and *c* occurs several times in A. The apex may be responsible for such errors as *an* for *a* and of *hinc* for *hic*, of which there are some half-dozen cases; it may have contributed to the error *contra* (*c̄tra*) for *o terra* (*ó tra*) in A (207. 3); in this case the apex was combined with the abbreviating stroke; in 120. 10 A actually has an apex over *o* in *o iurgantis* (for *obiurgantis*). There are a dozen cases where A omits *i* after letters which admit an *i*-subscript; the practice of writing *i* (and *a*) in ligature below the line, especially characteristic of the Insular script, often caused the letter to be omitted; in one case A wrote *minimi* (41. 8) with three *i*'s subscript; this was probably so written in *a*.

Another peculiarity of Insular scribes, reflected in A about fifty times, is the omission of one of two double consonants or the doubling of single consonants, e.g. *apareo*, *comorata*, *erat* (= *errat*), *teritus*, *percuero*, *teror*, *sumus*, *amisis*, *none*, *opido*, *ociso*, etc., and *gerrit*, *rapparet*, *commis*, etc. These errors are rare in B, as the scribe was probably the scholar who revised and condensed the text for his

own use; he eliminated most of the misspellings. Many such errors sifted down through the β family into C, but the Italian scholars would naturally correct most of them.

The archetype did not have the words separated as the following errors show: 30. 12 *poeta sed*] *poetas* A (*s.* = *sed*); 44. 16 *positi sunt*] *positis*; A (*s* = *sunt*); 121. 5 *scripta sunt*] *scriptas* A; 177. 5 *paucis*] *pauci sunt* A; 211. 10 *dies*] *die s* A; 91. 12 *non* (i.e. *n*) *Oedipus*] *nōie* (i.e. *nomine*) *dippus* A; 98. 16 *ut Lesbia*] *utiles. ina* A. Many errors were caused by the fact that the letters were compactly written, e.g. 36. 15 *initium* (with initial *I*-longa) *butium* A; 63. 1 *interea*] *hic ea* (i.e. from *Int ea*); the confusion of *hi* for *In* is a characteristic Insular symptom. Other errors are: *id* for *ul*, *ul* for *id*, *ol* and *cl* for *d*, *di* for *ch*, *du* for *hi* (e.g. *duo* for *hic* in A, 136. 2; this is not, then, an Insular symptom as Lejay assumed [see p. 289, n. 3]; the error could occur in ordinary minuscule); *li* for *b*, *iq* for *up*, etc.

Turning now to the β family we find, according to Wessner, that it divides into two groups, one represented by V, the other by the lost Carnotensis. Accepting for the moment this scheme as the correct one, it can be shown that β was an Insular MS. I cite here only the evidence of V. We find *p* for *n* 199. 6 where V has *voluptatem* for *voluntatem* and probably 487. 19 where V² reads *voluntarium*, with *n* in an erasure; *n* for *r*: possibly 245. 16 *cur*] *cum* V, with *cur* written above by V²; ii. 74. 18 *rursus*] *nutus* V; *r* for *n*: 431. 1 *Donacem*] *doracem* V, so also 435. 7 and 448. 4; ii. 469. 12 *ante*] *arte* V; *r* for *p*: 439. 8 *torporem* CV², *terrorem* V; ii. 20. 11 *aptius*] *artius* V.

Insular abbreviations again caused trouble; e.g. 125. 13 *tantum*] V² *tamen* V; ii. 48. 18 *hodie*] *autem* V; the word was written as a suspension as is often the case in a lemma, and *h* was mistaken as the Insular abbreviation for *autem* (*h*, with a suspension stroke). In 120. 11 V has *qñ* for *quoniam*, a form that Lindsay finds in the older continental specimens of the Anglo-Saxon script¹—among them a MS written in the script of Fulda, the type of Anglo-Saxon script that prevailed at Mayence; ii. 280. 15 V has *quoniam* for *quando*. Lindsay² cites *qñ* for *quando* from an old Mayence codex Vat. lat. 1447; ii. 478. 14 V has *quin* for *quando*, RCO have *quoniam*; evi-

¹ *Notae Latinae*, p. 263.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 221.

dently β has $q\bar{n}$; ii. 276. 7 V has the Insular abbreviation for *id est* (i·). Two Insular abbreviations are probably involved in the error 475. 21 where all the MSS (a lacking) have *unde* for *bene* ($u\bar{n}$ = *unde*, $b\bar{n}$ = *bene*¹); the same error occurs in V (ii. 472. 1); $u\bar{n}$ for *bene* is found in T (159. 12); this form caused the error of *uestri* (= $u\bar{r}i$) for *unde* in T (317. 2).

What do we know about the archetype of V? We have proved that it was Insular. We know that it was an old MS; in the margin of V, opposite *Hecyra* v. 3. 1, where there is a gap in the text, the scribe has written "deletum propter vetustatem." This sounds suspiciously like two marginal notes found in R, a copy of the Moguntinus ("consumptae erant litterae ob vetustatem" and "deletae sunt litterae") but V cannot be a copy of the Moguntinus. There are a thousand errors in the Moguntinus not found in V. Sabbadini,² assuming that a certain gap in V was caused by the omission of a single line, argued for a small script with many abbreviations. He dates the archetype in the twelfth or thirteenth century, that being the period when condensation reached its maximum. But the Insular script is capable of condensation equally great; the Insular scribes, more than any others, practiced the art of economizing time and money—and parchment cost money and abbreviations saved time and space. The archetype of V, like that of AB, was probably written in a compact script with many abbreviations.

We come now to the script of the Carnotensis. According to Wessner's stemma we must depend upon the readings of the Moguntinus and the descendants of Aurispa's copy of the Carnotensis; the latter, however, have suffered so much from interpolation and crossing that it is impossible to reconstruct their archetype with any degree of certainty. If the following errors are peculiar to TC, as they probably are (Wessner does not give the readings of the *deteriores* here), we may assume that the Carnotensis was an Insular MS: 149. 4 *u.c.a.p.] ucar.* TC; 204. 2 *non eveniet] pene (pone C) veniet* TC; 260. 16 *gnatam] gratam T; grata T*; 230. 11 *g.t.p.r.s.] c.(t. T) r.n.n.s.* TC; 283. 16 *fontem] fortem* TC. In any case these errors

¹ Lindsay, *Notae Latinae*, p. 26, cites one example of this syllabic suspension for *bene* from an eighth-century Anglo-Saxon MS, Boulogne 63-64.

² *Studi ital.*, II, 45.

show that the Moguntinus was a copy, direct or indirect, of an Insular MS. The evidence of O in two passages might also indicate that the Carnotensis was an Insular MS; ii. 481. 5 *repandum] ore pardum* O; in ii. 437. 19 RC have *cum citatione* for *concitatiore* (OV); since R and C are independent copies of the Moguntinus the latter MS must have had *cum citatione* and, if it was a copy of the Carnotensis, the latter must have been in the Insular script and the error must have been made by the copyist of the Moguntinus. The error could not have been in the Carnotensis since Aurispa's copy of this MS (represented by O) had the right reading. The position of O, however, is very uncertain; its affinity with RC is very strong; in fact Wessner later¹ derives it from the Moguntinus. In the rearrangement of the stemma which I shall suggest there is no difficulty in proving that the Carnotensis was an Insular MS and was copied from an Insular MS.

One old MS remains to be discussed, the lost Moguntinus. Here we are on firmer ground. Candido in his letter accompanying the copy of the *Phormio* which he made from the Moguntinus for Pizzolpasso (see above, p. 285) writes feelingly of the difficulties of his task. His statements might be discounted as due to a desire to magnify his service or to excuse his errors—Italian scribes were likely enough to exaggerate the difficulties caused by the script—but there are two expressions in his letter that make it clear that he is dealing with realities. He refers to "*barbariem quendam veteris scripturae*" and "*cariam vetusti operis*," which must refer, not to the text, as Dziatzko assumed, but to the MS and the script. We have to do, therefore, with an old MS; it was in bad condition and the script was unusual. If Candido had used a technical term he would have called the script "*Langobardica*" (i.e. "*barbarous*"). That the script was difficult is proved by the numerous errors in RTC; that the MS was old and in bad condition is shown by the marginal notes in R, opposite gaps in the text ("*consumptae erant litterae ob vetustatem*" and "*deletae sunt litterae*"). The fact that these omitted passages are found in C, another descendant of the Moguntinus, need mean only that R was a less painstaking scribe or less skilful; in fact the corrector of R did add passages that the

¹ *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift*, 1906, 797.

copyist omitted. According to Wessner's stemma three copies were made of the Moguntinus, represented by R, TCF, and Aurispa's transcript. The last is of little use, either from a critical or paleographical standpoint, since the MSS derived from it are badly interpolated; R contains only the *Phormio*; we are therefore compelled to rely almost entirely upon the readings of TC (the readings of F are given by Wessner only for the *Vita* and the *Tractatus de comoedia*) for the reconstruction of the Moguntinus. The picture we thus get of the Moguntinus is greatly obscured, since we see it through the medium of intervening fifteenth-century archetype of TC. An examination, however, of the cases where T and C disagree will show that their archetype could not have been a fifteenth-century MS; we find the same sort of evidence with which we have grown familiar in examining the archetypes of AB and of V—and more of it. The number of cases where *n*, *p*, and *r* are confused is striking; e.g. *n* for *p*: 255. 9 *voluptati*] *voluntati* T; *p* for *r*: 21. 5 *Rinthonicas*] *pinthorijcas* (*rij* corrected from *ris*) C, *rynthonicas* C2; 449. 18 *reticemus*]2 *Pee ticemus* T; *p* for *n*: 126. 12 *nunc iam*] V2, *nuptia* T, *nunciata* C; 241. 15 *omnium*] *impiusum* (*s* expunged) C, *enim* T (this may have been corrupt in the Moguntinus); 305. 19 *voluntatis*] *voluptatis* T (the same error in T 308. 4 and 400. 11); possibly 416. 14 *diminutivum*] *ditopanatum* C (in the archetype of C the reading was probably *ditopatium*, with *na* above *pa* as a correction); *n* for *r*: 122. 15 *ratione*] *nomine* C (*ratione* was abbreviated *rōe* and was mistaken for *nōe*, the common abbreviation for *nomine*); ii. 432. 12 may belong here, *rationem*] *nom̄* (from *rom̄*) RC, *numero* V, *vim* O; 133. 5 *cur*] C2, *cum* C, *cui* T; 201. 12 *quarto*] *qnto* T; 232. 8 *officiorum*] *offensionem* TC, *officionem* T (in margin); 274. 5 *possessorem*] *pozessionem* T; 279. 22 *diversorium*] *discensorium* T; 376. 10 *littera*] *lrā* VC, *nā* T; 404. 12 *cur*] *cū* T; *r* for *n*: 25. 21 *Rinthonica*] *sinthorica* T; 74. 1 *peccationis*] *peccatoris* T; 110. 11 *i.n.a.p.*] *n.r.a.p.* C; 117. 11 *conventionem*] *conventorem* T; possibly 352. 21 *bene*] *dī*, corrected to *dīr* T (*bñ* = *bene*; cf. ii. 420. 1 where R has *bñ* for *dicitur*).

The following errors occur in that part of the text where T is lacking, but it is safe to assume that most of them existed in the archetype: *n* for *p*: ii. 231. 9 *voluptatis*] *voluntatis* C, so also ii. 297. 21; *p* for *n*: ii. 222. 23 *inertia* V, *ineptiam* C; *n* for *r*: ii. 324. 16 *quantopere*]

quanta pene C; ii. 483. 12 *corde*] CV *condere* RO; *r* for *n*: 462. 24 *cur*] V, *cum* C; ii. 11. 11 *retentum*] *retortum* CV²; *p* for *r*: ii. 360. 4 *rei*] *pei* C.

This mass of evidence proves two things: (1) that T and C are not derived from the same fifteenth-century archetype—no renaissance script could have caused so many errors of the type listed above; we have here two descendants of the Moguntinus instead of one. The agreement of TC, therefore, represents a text that has escaped the revising hand of the Humanists and brings us six centuries nearer to the uncial archetype. (2) The Moguntinus was written in the Insular script.

Neither T nor C is a direct copy of the Moguntinus. This is proved for C by the fact that it has errors in common with F where T preserves the right reading; for T one error furnishes sufficient proof, 17. 17 *smis* for *sententiis*; *s̄nis* would not occur in a ninth-century MS.

The Moguntinus, therefore, was written in the eighth and ninth centuries and not in the twelfth as Sabbadini and Wessner assumed. They based their conclusion on the confusion of *et* and *in* and of *et* and *quia*. There is indeed an extraordinary number of cases of these confusions in T and C (nearly fifty) but the same errors are found in other MSS (BVRO) and three or four times in X, the archetype of all our MSS.

We have shown that of Wessner's three archetypes of the Italian MSS two were Insular and one a copy of an Insular codex. But were there really three archetypes? Wessner in his first classification¹ derived V from the Moguntinus, and the *deteriores*, with one or two exceptions, from the Carnotensis. He made the Moguntinus and the Carnotensis independent, each of the other. His later grouping was determined largely by two lacunae, a large one in the *Hecyra*² involving the loss of several quaternions, a small one in the *Phormio*³ involving the loss of one, or possibly, two folios, and by the fact that in the better MSS the scholia for *Phormio* ii. 3 are arranged in two series, while in the *deteriores* this double version has been revised into a single composite one. His starting-point was the passage in Valla's letter (see above, p. 286) where it is

¹ *Rheinisches Museum*, LII, 95.

² iii. 5. 8—v. 1. 2.

³ ii. 1. 4—9.

stated that in the Carnotensis the *Hecyra* was "non integra" and the *Phormio* was "cum defectu." According to his theory the Moguntinus was copied from the Carnotensis¹ which at that time had only the *Phormio* lacuna; later the Carnotensis suffered a further loss of leaves in the *Hecyra* and both of these lacunae passed into Aurispa's apograph. It was natural enough, since RCO actually have a lacuna in the *Phormio*, to identify the "defectus" in the Carnotensis with the *Phormio* lacuna in the Moguntinus. But this theory is not without its difficulties. In the first place it forced Wessner to assume that there was another archetype, entirely independent of the Carnotensis and the Moguntinus, from which V descended, for V alone among the *meliores* does not have the *Phormio* lacuna.² In the second place it forced him to assume that the *Phormio* lacuna in Aurispa's apograph was immediately filled in, because with two exceptions all the MSS of this family lack the lacuna. The two exceptions are Oa, which as I have said above (p. 299) show a strong affinity for RC, copies of the Moguntinus, and which Wessner himself later groups with the Moguntinus family. If we remove these two MSS therefore there is no need to assume that the Carnotensis and Aurispa's apograph ever had the *Phormio* lacuna; in that case we can make V a copy, direct or indirect, of Aurispa's apograph and so eliminate the third archetype.

What was then the "defectus" in the Carnotensis? It is perhaps significant that while Valla's informant reports that the *Hecyra* is "non integra" he speaks only of a "defectus" in the *Phormio*, as if there were a difference in kind, though it could refer, of course, to a small lacuna. Sabbadini suggested³ that it might refer to the gradual thinning out of the scholia in the latter half of the *Phormio*; Wessner at first accepted this explanation⁴ only to reject it in his

¹ There is no proof whatever that the Moguntinus was a copy of the Carnotensis. The situation could have been met equally well by making the two MSS *gemelli*, assigning the *Phormio* lacuna to the archetype and putting the *Hecyra* lacuna in the Carnotensis.

² V does not have the *Hecyra* lacuna either but this fact has no bearing on the argument. As Wessner has clearly shown, V belongs to the *meliores* only as far as *Ad. ii. 3*. After this point it was copied for the most part from a MS belonging to the LeN family which did not have the lacuna.

³ *Studi ital.*, II, 53.

⁴ *Rheinisches Museum*, LII, 83.

edition.¹ It is possible, however, that the "defectus" may refer to the double recension in the *Phormio*; here we find the following notes in V: "error in exemplari. A," "verte usque ad tale signum," "haec praecedunt ea quae praecesserant ante in tali signo" "dupplicata sunt et tamen aliter dici videntur quam antea dicta sunt." It is quite clear that V is following here one of the *meliores* though in general he follows a MS of the poorer class after *Ad. ii. 3* (see footnote, p. 302)—only the *meliores* have the double recension. These marginal notes may be the work of a fifteenth-century scholar (A=Aurispa?) but such notes are common enough in ninth-century MSS. I am inclined to believe that these or similar marginal notes were in the Carnotensis and furnish the explanation of the "defectus." They are more likely to have attracted attention than the dropping out of a single folio.

The assumption that there were more than two archetypes is therefore not only unnecessary but it is also improbable. The correspondence of the Humanists shows how keen they were in the search for new MSS, how close their contact was with one another, how rapidly the news spread when a new MS was brought to light, and how eager they were to correct their copies. This was especially true in the case of Donatus, as Aurispa's correspondence shows. Is it likely that another old MS of Donatus—the archetype of V was an Insular codex—one that filled a gap existing in all the other MSS, could be brought into Italy and used, without any mention being made of it, brought not merely to Italy but to Florence, the center of Donatus' study, and more than that, brought into the same *scriptorium* that produced a half-dozen other MSS of Donatus?² Wessner³ advanced much the same kind of argument against Sabbadini's assumption that there were ten independent copies of Donatus in Italy.⁴

¹ Praef. p. xxvii.

² According to Wessner, Praef. p. xxx, VOacdLN were written in the famous *scriptorium* of Vespasiano.

³ *Rheinisches Museum*, LII, 73.

⁴ Ambrosianus L 53 sup., a miscellaneous MS of the fifteenth century, discovered by Sabbadini (*Studi ital.*, XI, 185) contains at the end the *Vita* of Donatus, the treatise on tragedy and comedy, and the Preface to the *Andria*. It belonged to

In considering the improbability that there were three archetypes in Italy it is well to bear in mind the circumstances in which the Latin texts that are preserved only in MSS of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries have been transmitted to us. Almost without exception they owe their preservation to the fact that during this period a single MS was discovered and copied. I give the list: Asconius, all our MSS from three copies of the St. Gall codex, discovered by Poggio and his friends; Catullus, from the lost Verona; Cicero, *Brutus*, from the lost codex of Lodi which is also the source of the *integri* of the *De oratore* and the *Orator*; *Pro Roscio Amerino* and *Pro Murena* from Poggio's lost Cluniacensis; also *Pro Roscio comoedo*, both *Pro Rabirio's* from a lost codex of Poggio; Nepotianus, one MS; *Panegyrici*, three copies of a lost Moguntinus, the Italian MSS from Aurispa's copy; Petronius, *Cena*, one MS; *Priapeia*, all from a lost ninth-century codex; Pelagonius, one MS; Rutilius Namatianus, two sixteenth-century copies of a lost Bobbio codex; Silius Italicus, *Punica*, all from Poggio's copy; Statius, *Silvae*, all from Poggio's copy of the St. Gall MS; Tacitus, minor works, all from Hersfeldensis, of which one quaternion still survives; Tibullus, all from one MS which appeared in Italy in the fourteenth century. There are two families of MSS of Cicero's *Pro Quinctio* and apparently two for the letters to Atticus, Brutus, and Quintus, but the date of the archetype is uncertain. The existence of two Cicero MSS in Italy would not cause surprise, but the only library in Italy where one might expect to find an Insular codex of Donatus was Bobbio whose treasures, curiously enough, escaped the notice of the

Pizzolpasso, who apparently brought it from France. There is no indication that the MS was ever used by the Humanists; we may doubt whether Pizzolpasso recognized the fragment as belonging to the *Commentum*. If he obtained it while he was bishop of Aquis in Gascony (1422-23) as Sabbadini asserts (*Storia e critica di testi latini*, p. 121), ten years before the Moguntinus was discovered, he had no means of identifying the text for there is no heading, except a late one, in the MS. The text of the Ambrosianus is independent of the Italian tradition, being closer to A than any other MS. Some parts of the text are written twice, due, according to Sabbadini, to the difficult script of the archetype. We may have here again the old story—the difficult Insular script. In one version the scribe wrote *scipiore*, in the other *scipione*; one has *cum*, the other *em* (from the Insular abbreviation \bar{c} =*cum*); one has *Ielio*, the other *bello*, corrected to *Ielio*; we also find *appollinantes* for *appollinares* and *mrmicum* for *mimicum* (i.e. *mymicum*). There are many cases of single consonants for double and vice versa. There is not evidence enough, however, to warrant a definite conclusion.

Humanists until the close of the fifteenth century. Fortune was, therefore, lavish when she bestowed two old MSS of Donatus on the Humanists; to have given them a third would have been an act of unparalleled generosity.

To sum up: The archetype of the *Commentum* was written in uncials with the lemmata in rustic capitals; at least two MSS intervened between the original and the immediate archetype of our MSS (X); one of these was probably in Caroline minuscule, the other in a compact Insular script with many abbreviations; the script of X is uncertain. Two copies were made of X, α and β ; both of them were Insular. The Carnotensis and the Moguntinus are copies of β ; both again Insular. V is a copy, direct or indirect, of Aurispa's apograph of the Carnotensis. T descended independently from the Moguntinus, with at least one copy intervening, and is not derived from the same fifteenth-century MS as C (F). O (and a) are probably descendants of the Moguntinus.